

WEST/EAST SUBCOMMITTEE MINUTES
RAMONA COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP
15873 HWY 67, RAMONA, CA 92065
RAMONA COMMUNITY CENTER
434 AQUA LANE, RAMONA
SEPTEMBER 24, 2008, 7:00 P.M.

mlo 10/24
RECEIVED
OCT 23 2008
San Diego County
DEPT. OF PLANNING & LAND USE

1. CALL TO ORDER – 7:10 p.m.
2. DETERMINATION OF MEMBERS PRESENT – Consideration Will be Given to Members Who Have Missed Consistently. They Will Be Removed And Will Need to Reapply for Membership.

Members Present: Kristi Mansolf, Chair; George Boggs, Carolyn Dorroh, Charlotte Hambly, Kareen Madden, Beverly Maes (Arrived at 8:20), Vivian Osborn, Luauna Stines (Arrived at 8:20)

Excused Absence: Richard Jarrett

Absent: Jeff Lachine

Guests: Thure Stedt, Kevin O'Connor, Leslie Souza, Cliff Fuerst, Christopher and Sally Kloman, Lisa LeFors, Frank and Alice Pecoraro, Johnny Romine, David Fuller, Jack Allen

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS – None
4. PRESENTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS ONLY – None

MOTION: TO BRING ITEM 8 FORWARD.

Upon motion made by George Boggs and seconded by Kareen Madden, the Motion passed 6-0-0-4, with Richard Jarrett, Jeff Lachine, Beverly Maes and Luauna Stines absent.

8. P87-028W1, Highland Valley Ranch, Modification of an Existing Major Use Permit to Expand an Adult Care Facility from 16 Residents to 52 Residents, and to Add 23,252 Sq Ft to the Facility (Action)

Thure Stedt presented the project. Currently a care facility for 16 traumatic brain injured patients is on site. The project proposes to increase the number of resident patients to 52. There are currently 13 employees. The project proposes to increase the number of employees to 25. The proposed access is off Highland Valley Rd. There will be 4 new buildings – 2 new residence homes, a gym and an office building. A package treatment plant is proposed to treat the effluent. It is essential for the care of the patients that their homes be residential in nature and in a residential area. This type of facility is Mr. O'Connor's specialty. The need has risen dramatically for these types of facilities. There are 3, 8-acre parcels that they are merging with the proposed Major Use Permit

modification. The residential units will be residential in nature, single story and stucco. There is a wet weather storage pond that has the capacity to accumulate treated wastewater for an 85 day period should there be an excessive amount of rain. The wastewater will be treated to a tertiary level.

Mr. Fuerst, Salida Del Sol resident, has concerns about the storage pond.

Mr. Stedt said the treated water will be used on site for irrigation. The State does quarterly monitoring of package treatment facilities. It is only if it rains, treated water will not be used for irrigation.

Mr. Boggs said that he believes the package treatment plant has to be maintained by an entity. He wants to see a letter from the State. He wants to know who will run the facility.

Mr. O'Connor asked to retire discussion of the package treatment plant because they could not address the questions and needed their engineer to do so. He will bring the information to the RCPG meeting.

Ms. Osborn said the Ramona Community Plan discourages package treatment plants.

Ms. Dorroh asked if there was a back-up generator?

Mr. Stedt said there would be AC and a backup generator. They will eliminate the septic and wells. They will not tie the proposed expansion to the facility Mr. O'Connor operates across Highland Valley Rd.

Mr. Boggs said T&T had a concern with site distance. They asked for a right turn lane for southbound traffic and a left turn lane for northbound traffic. There is a concern if trucks are to enter the facility. The access to the property is being moved to the north of where it is now.

Mr. Stedt said the driveway was being moved so that adequate site distance could be met.

Mr. Boggs said that he doesn't feel by moving the access, adequate site distance will be met. People go very fast around the curves in the road.

Mr. Stedt said there will be a 13 passenger bus for the facility, staff traffic and weekend visitor traffic.

When asked about deliveries, Mr. O'Connor said there would be 1 truck delivery per week – this is currently the case. Delivery traffic will not increase.

Mr. Stedt said that staff will not contribute to peak traffic. They will be paying into the TIF. They are not sure of the amount yet.

Question from the audience: Ms. LaFlors asked about therapists going to the site?

Mr. Stedt said therapists will be coming during non-peak traffic hours.

Mr. Allen has concerns that the road along the south border of the property will be used.

Mr. Stedt said Mr. O'Connor's property has the 60 foot easement (includes a 30 foot easement on both sides of the property line) on his deed. In 1987 the Major Use Permit was applied for by the previous owner. The road at the south end of the property can be used in a disaster.

Ms. LaFlors asked what will happen to the gate when the electricity goes out?

Ms. Sally Kloman has a road on the north side of the property. She has concerns with having to remove trees and foliage.

Mr. Stedt said she won't have to remove anything.

Mr. Frank Pecorra said there is a lot of traffic on Highland Valley Rd. and it is hard to get out of the driveways along it.

Ms. Dorroh asked about the 12 foot road within the project?

Mr. Stedt said the road will be 2-way. If necessary, the road could be widened from 12 to 16 feet. There are driveway standards used within a project rather than road standards.

Mr. Allen asked if the road within the project was to be paved?

Mr. Boggs wanted to see a letter from the Fire Department saying they are happy with the project plans.

Ms. Dorroh asked if there were a trail with the project?

Mr. Stedt said there was no trail.

Ms. Dorroh asked about where the gates intersected the roads, the half circle road at the south end of the project, and the trails within the project boundaries.

Mr. Stedt said the half circle is a cul de sac – a Fire Department requirement. Mr. Stedt said the trails in the orchard will stay.

Mr. Allen said the trees have dried up on the property.

Mr. Fuerst has concerns with where the runoff will go when it rains due to the development that is proposed.

Mr. Stedt said there are Limited Impact Development (LID) standards. Water runoff cannot leave the site when it rains. They also can't interfere with the natural flow of water when it rains. They cannot increase volume flow or velocity. There will be a retention and detention basin on site so runoff doesn't leave the property. The drainage was accepted, and now it will have to be revised. There are increasing the surface area with the proposed development. He believed a 40 year average is used to determine runoff.

Ms. Mansolf said she would like to see the summary of the amount of runoff predicted and the capacity of the improvements such as the retention/detention basins. Ms. Mansolf said the project was seen by the RCPG a few years ago and the traffic study was just completed.

Mr. Stedt said the traffic study is out, but the RCPG only received a letter summary of it.

Ms. Leslie Souza asked why each parcel could not be used with a separate residence?

Mr. Stedt said they would only be allowed to have 6 residents per home/parcel.

Ms. Souza has 2 ponds on her property which she is concerned will be impacted from drainage from the project.

Mr. Stedt said the project should not impact her ponds.

Mr. Allen said the wet weather storage pond will be standing water after a few days.

Mr. Stedt said no vector control plan is required. This will not be pond water.

In response to what type of environmental document will be prepared, Mr. Stedt said a mitigated neg dec would probably be prepared.

Ms. Osborn said she felt an EIR would better address the impacts of the project. Also, the Major Use Permit findings of Z.O. No. 7358 must be met – bulk, scale, harmony, etc. for how the project impacts the neighborhood.

Mr. Kloman said the water runoff in wet weather comes across the road onto his property now.

Mr. Stedt said some water percs into the ground and some runs off.

Mr. Kloman was concerned if the patients' medicines would come out in the treated wastewater, and if it would leach into the groundwater?

Mr. Allen said the grounds are not maintained now. The grove is not being watered. Other areas are not being watered.

Ms. Dorroh asked if the holding pond would be fenced in?

Mr. Stedt said it would.

Next Community Character was discussed. It was stated that there is going to be a 300 percent increase in clientele. There were questions about what comes after this? The original owner, when he received the Major Use Permit, said he didn't intend to expand. Mr. O'Connor is saying he won't expand, but the next owner may want to. First there were 6 people in a residential care facility, then there was a new owner and the Major Use Permit applied for. This is a rural, agricultural area. The proposed project is a business, a commercial enterprise proposed in a rural, residential, agricultural area. Will there be another expansion requested in 5 years?

Mr. O'Connor said he has solved a lot of the problems with the facility. As concerns staffing, there will be 25 staff. They worked staggered shifts.

Ms. Mansolf asked if each unit with patients that need more supervision will be staffed with a supervisor during the night?

Mr. O'Connor said that should be the case.

There were concerns with the 4,000 sq. ft. gymnasium being visible from the scenic corridor.

There were concerns with the grove and the property perimeter. Landscape is not being watered. The palm trees are not being maintained. There was a dump under the existing grove, which is also not maintained.

Mr. Stedt said there has been some cleanup already. There will be reinstitution of the grove. This facility has been there for 20 years.

Ms. Leslie Souza has concerns with community character. This is such a large project for the area.

Mr. Stedt said they want to spread out the facility and not have a 4 story facility.

Ms. Kloman said the facility is a business in a residential/agricultural area. The applicant is asking to modify a permit. The number of people and buildings there now are good. The project is expanding a business in a major agricultural area. None of the neighbors can subdivide the land in the area. They will stay as dense as they are now. But the project is being proposed to expand 4 times to include more density and more development. Each 8 acre parcel could support one home. The applicant is asking for the right to add too much density and development for this area. How does this affect the community? They all knew what was there when they moved in and now it is being requested to expand it. Where will this stop? The previous owner said the facility

wouldn't be expanded when he got the Major Use Permit. In 10 years will it be asked to be expanded to 100 residents? She is concerned with the gym being lit at night.

There were concerns that the facility is lit up a lot now and how lit up will it be when expanded?

There were concerns with security now and in the future. Residents of the house sometimes leave the facility and end up on the neighbors' properties. Residents are docile 86 percent of the time. Sometimes they scream profanities in this quiet, residential area. How will the expansion further impact security?

Ms. Dorroh asked if there would be an assembly for outdoor activities?

Mr. Stedt said that would be no amplification on the property. Gym activities include physical therapy and exercise.

MOTION: TO DENY THE MODIFICATION/EXPANSION OF THE MAJOR USE PERMIT. FINDINGS PER SECTION 7358 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE CANNOT BE MET.

Upon motion made by George Boggs and seconded by Kareen Madden, the Motion passed 6-2-0-0-2, with Beverly Maes and Luauna Stines voting no, and Richard Jarrett and Jeff Lachine absent.

5. AD 08-019RPL, Private Horse Stable, 110 feet, 10-7/8 inches by 36 feet, 5- 3/4 inches, One-Story, at 15404 Highland Valley Rd. La Chapelle, Owner (Action)

Ms. Mansolf said the West Subcommittee had seen the project and had approved it, as did the RCPG. The scoping letter came out and the County required a Major Use Permit because they thought the ranch could have a commercial use. Ms. La Chapelle was unable to attend the West Subcommittee meeting. Ms. La Chapelle was required to change the name of the stable to "private stable". Other items are labeled differently, too. She filled out a fire form that was approved by the Fire Department and submitted a vector control plan. The project hasn't changed.

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE REPLACEMENT MAP.

Upon motion made by George Boggs and seconded by Luauna Stines, the Motion passed 8-0-0-0-2, with Richard Jarrett and Jeff Lachine absent.

6. P08-012RPL, Verizon Cell Site on Raw Land, Sutherland Dr., Leonard, Owner. 40 Foot Mono Broadleaf Tree. Hill, Representative (Action) *East Project*

Ms. Mansolf said that the applicant could not be attendance but asked that the item be kept on the agenda. The RCPG had approved this item, but a neighbor had been

attendance who had concerns with how the faux tree would look from his property. Mr. Marioncelli emailed a photo simulation taken from the neighbor's property. Should the neighbor attend the RCPG meeting, Mr. Marioncelli wanted this photo to be available.

7. AD08-048, Administrative Permit to Place an 8 Foot Fence Along 1/8th of the Property Line at 15316 Sky High Rd. Mounier, Owner (Action)

The Mounier's came to the West Subcommittee to protest a neighbor's cell site in the past. They already had a cell site on one side of their property. The new cell site has been put in – a faux chimney. The Mounier's couldn't be attendance at the meeting. Ms. Mansolf read the justification for their request to put an 8 foot fence along approximately 210 feet of their property line. They want to keep the neighbor's dog off their property, don't want to have to look at their neighbor's property.

MOTION: TO DENY THE 8 FOOT FENCE.

Upon motion made by Luauna Stines and seconded by Beverly Maes, the Motion failed 3-4-1-0-2, with George Boggs, Carolyn Dorroh, Kareen Madden and Vivian Osborn voting no, Kristi Mansolf abstaining and Richard Jarrett and Jeff Lachine absent.

9. TM 5554, GPA 08-006, MUP P08-032, P71-396-01, PAA 08-006, ER Log No. 08-09-007, Notice of Preparation, EIR, for Ramona Air Center Development Plan Project, Ramona Airport

Ms. Osborn said the private parcel was not included in the EIR that included the extension of the runway and expansion of facilities already located at the airport. The EIR that was approved (created in 2002) was for the County Airport land only. It was stated in the EIR for the sewer upgrade (2002) that the extension of the sewer would not be growth inducing as it is for the County Airport only and would not serve any other development. This extension of the sewer to the private parcel needs to be addressed in the Project EIR.

Ms. Dorroh said the parcel was not included in the sewer service area when the sewer was added to the Airport. Should this be the case, the addition of the private parcel into the sewer service area should be included in the NOP and addressed in the EIR.

The meeting adjourned at 9:30, during this item, as subcommittee members had not read the NOP yet.

No action taken.

10. Corrections/Approval to the Minutes 8-25-08 (Action) – Not Addressed

11. Adjournment – 9:30

Respectfully submitted,

Kristi Mansolf